



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CK

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/349,479	12/02/1994	WAYNE A. BORDER	PLA 1245	6468
41552	7590	04/06/2006	EXAMINER	
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY			GAMBEL, PHILLIP	
4370 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE, SUITE 700				
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1644
DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/349,479	BORDER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Phillip Gabel	1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment, filed 1/10/06, has been entered.

Claims 1-20 and 22-34 have been canceled previously.

Claim 21 is pending.

2. Upon an updated search and given the broadest reasonable interpretation of claims, a New Grounds of Rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double over U.S. Patent 5,824,655.

The examiner apologizes for any inconvenience to applicant in this matter.

3. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obvious-type or non-obvious-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); *In re Van Ornam*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78 (d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a Terminal Disclaimer. A Terminal Disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 21 stands provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 5-7, 10 and 13-15 of copending application USSN 10/638,172.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the pending claims of both the instant and copending applications are drawn to the same or nearly the same methods of treating glomerulonephritis with anti-TGF- β antibodies as they read on the elected invention of copending application USSN 10/638,172. Therefore, the instant and copending claims would anticipate on one another.

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant notes that the if the provisional double patent rejection is the only remaining rejection and the copending application has not bee placed in condition for allowance, the double patenting rejection is requested to be withdrawn.

However, given the non-provisional double patenting rejection set forth herein, the rejection is maintained for the reasons of record.

Again, the examiner apologizes for any inconvenience to applicant in this matter.

5. Claim 21 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 U.S. Patent No. 5,824,655.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the pending claims of both the instant and copending applications are drawn to the same or nearly the same methods of treating glomerulonephritis with anti-TGF- β antibodies.

While it is acknowledged that the patented methods operate via introducing into the subject a nucleic acid encoding an anti-TGF- β antibody, the reduction of deleterious accumulation of TGF- β -induced extracellular matrix associated with glomerulonephritis in a subject,

The patented claims anticipate the instant method,

Since the tissue would be contacted with anti- TGF- β antibody which would suppress accumulation of extracellular matrix in the tissue in patients with glomerulonephritis.

Therefore, the patented claims would anticipate the pending claim., given the broadest interpretation of the claims.

6. Claim 21 is directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-7 of commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 5,824,655 for the reasons above.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300). Commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 5,824,655, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

7. No claim allowed.

Art Unit: 1644

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip Gambel whose telephone number is (571) 272-0844. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (571) 272-0841.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Phillip Gambel, Ph.D., J.D.
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 1600
April 3, 2006